

**Before the  
Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554**

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
Time Warner Cable Inc.	)	CSR 8515-E
	)	
Petition for Determination of Effective	)	
Competition in Thirty Ohio Franchise Areas	)	

**MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER**

**Adopted: October 21, 2011**

**Released: October 27, 2011**

By the Senior Deputy Chief, Policy Division, Media Bureau:

**I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND**

1. Time Warner Cable Inc., hereinafter referred to as “Petitioner,” has filed with the Commission a petition pursuant to Sections 76.7, 76.905(b)(2) and 76.907 of the Commission’s rules for a determination that Petitioner is subject to effective competition in those communities listed on Attachment A and hereinafter referred to as the “Communities.” Petitioner alleges that its cable system serving the Communities is subject to effective competition pursuant to Section 623(l)(1)(B) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (“Communications Act”),<sup>1</sup> and the Commission’s implementing rules,<sup>2</sup> and is therefore exempt from cable rate regulation in the Communities because of the competing service provided by two direct broadcast satellite (“DBS”) providers, DIRECTV, Inc. (“DIRECTV”), and DISH Network (“DISH”). The petition is unopposed.

2. In the absence of a demonstration to the contrary, cable systems are presumed not to be subject to effective competition,<sup>3</sup> as that term is defined by Section 623(l) of the Communications Act and Section 76.905 of the Commission’s rules.<sup>4</sup> The cable operator bears the burden of rebutting the presumption that effective competition does not exist with evidence that effective competition is present within the relevant franchise area.<sup>5</sup> For the reasons set forth below, we grant the petition based on our finding that Petitioner is subject to effective competition in the Communities listed on Attachment A.

**II. DISCUSSION**

3. Section 623(l)(1)(B) of the Communications Act provides that a cable operator is subject to effective competition if the franchise area is (a) served by at least two unaffiliated multi-channel video programming distributors (“MVPDs”), each of which offers comparable video programming to at least 50 percent of the households in the franchise area; and (b) the number of households subscribing to programming services offered by MVPDs other than the largest MVPD exceeds 15 percent of the households in the franchise area.<sup>6</sup> This test is referred to as the “competing provider” test.

<sup>1</sup> See 47 U.S.C. § 543(l)(1)(B).

<sup>2</sup> 47 C.F.R. § 76.905(b)(2).

<sup>3</sup> 47 C.F.R. § 76.906.

<sup>4</sup> See 47 U.S.C. § 543(l)(1); 47 C.F.R. § 76.905(b).

<sup>5</sup> See 47 C.F.R. §§ 76.906-907(b).

<sup>6</sup> 47 U.S.C. § 543(l)(1)(B); see also 47 C.F.R. § 76.905(b)(2).

4. The first prong of this test has three elements: the franchise area must be “served by” at least two unaffiliated MVPDs who offer “comparable programming” to at least “50 percent” of the households in the franchise area.<sup>7</sup> It is undisputed that the Communities are “served by” both DBS providers, DIRECTV and DISH, and that these two MVPD providers are unaffiliated with Petitioner or with each other. A franchise area is considered “served by” an MVPD if that MVPD’s service is both technically and actually available in the franchise area. DBS service is presumed to be technically available due to its nationwide satellite footprint, and presumed to be actually available if households in the franchise area are made reasonably aware of the service’s availability.<sup>8</sup> The Commission has held that a party may use evidence of penetration rates in the franchise area (the second prong of the competing provider test discussed below) coupled with the ubiquity of DBS services to show that consumers are reasonably aware of the availability of DBS service.<sup>9</sup> We further find that Petitioner has provided sufficient evidence to support its assertion that potential customers in the Communities are reasonably aware that they may purchase the service of these MVPD providers.<sup>10</sup> The “comparable programming” element is met if a competing MVPD provider offers at least 12 channels of video programming, including at least one channel of nonbroadcast service programming,<sup>11</sup> and is supported in the petition with citations to the channel lineups for both DIRECTV and DISH.<sup>12</sup> Also undisputed is Petitioner’s assertion that both DIRECTV and DISH offer service to at least “50 percent” of the households in the Communities because of their national satellite footprint.<sup>13</sup> Accordingly, we find that the first prong of the competing provider test is satisfied.

5. The second prong of the competing provider test requires that the number of households subscribing to MVPDs, other than the largest MVPD, exceeds 15 percent of the households in a franchise area. Petitioner asserts that it is the largest MVPD in the Communities.<sup>14</sup> Petitioner sought to determine the competing provider penetration in the Communities by purchasing a subscriber tracking report from the Satellite Broadcasting and Communications Association that identified the number of subscribers attributable to the DBS providers within the Communities on a zip code plus four basis.<sup>15</sup>

6. Based upon the aggregate DBS subscriber penetration levels that were calculated using Census 2010 household data,<sup>16</sup> as reflected in Attachment A, we find that Petitioner has demonstrated that the number of households subscribing to programming services offered by MVPDs, other than the largest MVPD, exceeds 15 percent of the households in the Communities. Therefore, the second prong of the competing provider test is satisfied for each of the Communities. Based on the foregoing, we conclude

---

<sup>7</sup> 47 C.F.R. § 76.905(b)(2)(i).

<sup>8</sup> See Petition at 3.

<sup>9</sup> *Mediacom Illinois LLC*, 21 FCC Rcd 1175, 1176, ¶ 3 (2006).

<sup>10</sup> 47 C.F.R. § 76.905(e)(2).

<sup>11</sup> See 47 C.F.R. § 76.905(g); see also Petition at 5.

<sup>12</sup> See Petition at 6 (listings available at [www.directv.com](http://www.directv.com) and [dishnetwork.com](http://dishnetwork.com)).

<sup>13</sup> See *id.* at 6.

<sup>14</sup> See *id.* at 7 and Declaration of Chris Thomas, Director of Government Relations for the Northeast Ohio Division of Time Warner Cable (August 14, 2011). The Declaration was received via email on October 14, 2011 from Craig Gilley, Esq., counsel for Time Warner, to replace the Declaration of Pamela McDonald, Vice President of Government Relations for the Southwest Ohio Division of Time Warner Cable (September 1, 2011), which was attached to the record in this case.

<sup>15</sup> Petition at 7-8 and Exhibit C. A zip code plus four analysis allocates DBS subscribers to a franchise area using zip code plus four information that generally reflects franchise area boundaries in a more accurate fashion than standard five digit zip code information.

<sup>16</sup> Petition at 7-8 and Exhibit B.

that Petitioner has submitted sufficient evidence demonstrating that both prongs of the competing provider test are satisfied and Petitioner is subject to effective competition in the Communities listed on Attachment A.

### III. ORDERING CLAUSES

7. Accordingly, **IT IS ORDERED** that the petition for a determination of effective competition filed in the captioned proceeding by Time Warner Cable Inc. **IS GRANTED**.

8. **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the certification to regulate basic cable service rates granted to any of the Communities set forth on Attachment A **IS REVOKED**.

9. This action is taken pursuant to delegated authority pursuant to Section 0.283 of the Commission's rules.<sup>17</sup>

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Steven A. Broeckert  
Senior Deputy Chief, Policy Division, Media Bureau

---

<sup>17</sup> 47 C.F.R. § 0.283.

## ATTACHMENT A

## CSR 8515-E

## COMMUNITIES SERVED BY TIME WARNER CABLE INC.

<b>Communities (Counties)</b>	<b>CUIDs</b>	<b>CPR*</b>	<b>2010 Census Households</b>	<b>Estimated DBS Subscribers</b>
Bethel Township (Clark)	OH0754	17.38%	7,123	1,238
Bethel Township (Miami)	OH1280	27.10%	1,889	512
Concord Township	OH2956	45.72%	538	246
Gasper Township	OH2940	29.63%	1,404	416
Goshen Township	OH2941	29.62%	1,330	394
Gratis Township	OH2975	29.13%	1,634	476
Harrison Township (Montgomery)	OH0507	15.76%	9,964	1,570
Harrison Township (Preble)	OH2942	23.13%	1,777	411
Jackson Township (Montgomery)	OH2943	20.80%	2,385	496
Jackson Township (Preble)	OH2944	30.63%	457	140
Jefferson Township	OH2945	25.15%	1,356	341
Lanier Township	OH2914	28.11%	1,448	407
Mad River Township	OH2916	40.48%	1,045	423
Monroe Township (Darke)	OH2946	41.02%	646	265
Monroe Township (Logan)	OH2366	37.32%	611	228
Monroe Township (Preble)	OH2947	22.90%	847	194
Perry Township	OH2948	18.52%	2,371	439
Salem Township	OH2950	44.73%	910	407
Somers Township	OH2951	21.10%	1,564	330
Somerville Village	OH2952	28.13%	96	27
South Charleston Village	OH1244	15.97%	720	115
Springfield City	OH0279	15.07%	24,459	3,685
Spring Valley Village	OH0955	16.67%	198	33
Stokes Township	OH2423	28.92%	249	72
Sugarcreek Township	OH0977 OH2086	22.76%	2,786	634
Twin (Darke)	OH2953	15.21%	1,591	242

<b>Communities (Counties)</b>	<b>CUIDS</b>	<b>CPR*</b>	<b>2010 Census Households</b>	<b>Estimated DBS Subscribers</b>
Twin (Preble)	OH2954	33.37%	1,022	341
Union Township	OH2957	46.71%	805	376
Washington Township	OH2955	46.78%	684	320
Xenia Township	OH0189	23.34%	1,997	466

\*CPR = Percent of competitive DBS penetration rate.